

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/629,880	07/29/2003	Harry Leneau	29792-73218 5579 EXAMINER		
22446	7590 05/04/2006				
ICE MILLER LLP ONE AMERICAN SQUARE, SUITE 3100 INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46282-0200			HAWES, PILI ASABI		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		1615	1615	
			DATE MAILED: 05/04/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/629,880	LENEAU, HARRY				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	Pili A. Hawes ears on the cover sheet with the c	1615				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
· <u> </u>	·—					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 G.D. 11, 4:	03 U.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4)	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of References Cited (PTO-032) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1-21-03, 7-10-04, 12-20-04	Paper No(s)/Mail D					

Art Unit: 1615

DETAILED ACTION

Summary

Receipt of the Information Disclosure Statement(s) filed 07-29-2003, 07-16-2004, 12-20-2004 is acknowledged. Claims 1-13 are pending in this action. Claims 1-13 are rejected.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-13 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 6607745. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patented claims are directed toward a method for relieving joint pain or other discomforts associated with arthritis or fibromyalgia by administering an oral

Page 3

composition of hyaluronic acid. The hyaluronic acid is administered with a food acceptable carrier. The only difference between the patented claims and the instant claims is directed to treating joint pain or discomfort associated with joint disorders, while the patented claims recite the specific joint disorder such as arthritis and fibromyalgia. However the scope of the instant claims are overlapping with the patented claims as is evident by claims 5-6 which recite the arthritic conditions as the joint disorder.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for joint disorders such as arthritis, osteoarthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, and fibromyalgia, does not reasonably provide enablement for all ioint disorders. Joint disorders include carpal tunnel syndrome, canine hip dysplasia, systemic lupus erythematosus, tendonitis, and bursitis among others. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The specification has not shown that the composition is effective in carrying out the method of treating joint discomfort and joint pain associated with all joint disorders.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not Art Unit: 1615

described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 9 recites the effective amount of hyaluronic acid in the composition is 1-6 mg. However this limitation is not disclosed in the specification. The specification discloses that the concentrate can contain 1-10 mg of hyaluronic acid (page 4, line 20). The specification further discloses that each patient in the example received 1-4 mg of hyaluronic acid (page 4, line 30). However there is nowhere in the specification that discloses the 1-6 mg claimed in claim 9.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pierce US 6924273.

Pierce teaches a method of treating or preventing osteoarthritis, joint inflammation and pain by administering to a mammal hyaluronic acid (col. 4, lines 46-55 and col. 5, lines 30-35). The reference teaches using 0.1-.5 mg of hyaluronic acid per kg of body weight in the composition (col. 9, lines 34-39). The reference teaches the

Application/Control Number: 10/629,880 Page 5

Art Unit: 1615

effective amount for canines range from 2-8 mg. The compositions can be in the form of a paste, gel, tablets, and capsules (col. 11, lines 59-60). Example discloses a hyaluronic composition that comprises water as the food acceptable carrier (col. 17, lines 1-15).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pili A. Hawes whose telephone number is 571-272-8512. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page can be reached on 571-272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

P. A. Hawes Examiner-1615

THURMAN K. PAGE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600